REMARKS

Initially, Applicants thank the Examiner for the courtesies extended during the recent in-person interview held on February 21st. The claim amendments and arguments submitted in this paper are consistent with the amendments and arguments presented during the course of the interview. Accordingly, entry of this amendment and reconsideration of the pending claims is respectfully requested.

The Advisory Action dated December 27, 2007 considered claims 1-29. Claims 1-29 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Singhal et al. (US 7,096,418), hereinafter *Singhal*, in view of Sobeski (US 6,304,879), hereinafter *Sobeski*.[1]

By this amendment claims 1, 15, 28 and 29 have been amended.[2] Claims 31 and 32 have been added and claims 14 and 23-27 have been cancelled. Accordingly, claims 1-13, 15-22 and 31-37 are pending, of which claims 1, 15, 28, 29 and 31 are the only independent claims at issue.

The present invention is generally directed to customized cached dependencies. For example, claim 1 defines accessing an extensible cache dependency base class from which customized cache dependencies can be derived. The extensible cache dependency base class includes a plurality of inheritable cache management methods usable by customized dependencies derived from the extensible case dependency base class to determine the validity of one or more cache entries corresponding to the customized dependencies. Next, claim 1 defines deriving a customized cache dependency class from the extensible cache dependency base class. The customized cache dependency class inherits the plurality of inheritable cache management methods from the extensible cache dependency base class. The customized cache dependency class is also configured to implement further unique functionality of a customized dependency that extends the plurality of inheritable cache management methods included in the extensible cache dependency base class. The unique functionality includes providing a user-customized basis for determining the validity of cache entries associated with the customized cache dependency.

---

[1] Although the prior art status of the cited art is not being challenged at this time, Applicant reserves the right to challenge the prior art status of the cited art at any appropriate time, should it arise. Accordingly, any arguments and amendments made herein should not be construed as acquiescing to any prior art status of the cited art.
[2] Support for the amendments to the claims are found throughout the specification and previously presented claims, including but not limited to paragraphs [012]-[016] and [022]-[030] and Figures 1-3.

Claim 1 further defines accessing a portion of cached content that is to be delivered to a client computer system and creating a cache entry that associates the customized dependency with the accessed portion of cached content, where the customized dependency includes the user-customized basis for determining cache entry validity. Lastly, claim 1 defines determining that the cache entry is valid according to the user-customized basis for determining cache entry validity and inserting the determined valid cache entry into cache for delivery to the client computer system.

Claim 28 is a computer program product corresponding to claim 1. Claim 31 is a method claim similar to claim 1 that includes additional elements regarding the user-customized basis for determining the validity of cache entries.

Claim 15 is directed to a method for purging an invalid cache entry. Claim 15 defines monitoring one or more custom dependency conditions associated with a user-customized basis for determining validity of cache entries. The user-customized basis for determining validity of cache entries being is included in an instance of a customized cache dependency that extends a plurality of cache management methods inherited from an extensible cache dependency base class to implement unique functionality. The customized cache dependency corresponds to a customized cache dependency class that was derived from the extensible cache dependency base class, where the customized cache dependency includes the user-customized basis for determining cache entry validity.

Claim 15 further defines determining if the one or more custom dependency conditions have been satisfied and receiving an indication that the one or more custom dependency conditions have been satisfied. Lastly, claim 15 defines determining that the cache entry associated with the custom dependency conditions is invalid according to the user-customized basis for determining cache entry validity and purging the cache entry at the server computer system in response to determining that the cache entry is invalid.

Claim 29 is a computer program product corresponding to claim 15.

Applicants respectfully submit that the cited art of record does not anticipate or otherwise render the amended claims unpatentable for at least the reason that the cited art does not disclose, suggest, or enable each and every element of these claims.

35 U.S.C. 103 Rejections

Singhal describes a web page cache that stores web pages such that servers are be able to retrieve valid dynamic pages without going to a dynamic content server (Abs.). *Singhal* teaches invalidating a web page cache for one of two reasons. Either the time limit associated with the web page has expired (see Col. 8:17-28), or the underlying data of the web page has been changed due to some occurrence or event (see Col. 4:56-64, Col. 7:48-49, Col. 11:29-49). Once the data has changed, the page is automatically invalidated and deleted (or marked for later deletion). *Singhal* is silent on allowing a user to provide a customized basis for determining the validity of a cache entry that may be wholly separate from a change in data based on an event or an expiration of time.

Sobeski is cited primarily to show deriving a customized cache dependency class from the extensible cache dependency base class. Applicants maintain that *Sobeski* fails to teach this concept and has little, if anything, to do with cache dependencies. *Sobeski*'s data cache 206 is simply a storage location. There is no mention of data cache 206 being extendable or being a base class. *Sobeski* is further silent as to how other classes can be derived from data cache 206 to extend cache functionality and how properties of data cache 206 can be inherited by other data cache objects. Additionally, *Sobeski* is entirely silent on determining validity of cache entries.

Thus, none of the cited art teaches or suggests deriving a customized cache dependency class from the extensible cache dependency base class, where the customized cache dependency class inherits the plurality of inheritable cache management methods from the extensible cache dependency base class, where the customized cache dependency class is also configured to implement further unique functionality of a customized dependency that extends the plurality of inheritable cache management methods included in the extensible cache dependency base class, where the unique functionality includes providing a user-customized basis for determining the validity of cache entries associated with the customized cache dependency, as recited in claim 1.

Furthermore, none of the cited art teaches or suggests determining that the cache entry is valid according to the user-customized basis for determining cache entry validity, as recited in claim 1. At least for either of these reasons, claim 1 patentably defines over the art of record. At least for either of these reasons, claims 28 and 31 also patentably defines over the art of record.

Similarly, none of the cited art teaches or suggests monitoring one or more custom dependency conditions associated with a user-customized basis for determining validity of cache entries, the user-customized basis for determining validity of cache entries being included in an

instance of a customized cache dependency that extends a plurality of cache management methods inherited from an extensible cache dependency base class to implement unique functionality, where the customized cache dependency corresponds to a customized cache dependency class that was derived from the extensible cache dependency base class, where the customized cache dependency includes the user-customized basis for determining cache entry validity, as recited in claim 15. In view of the forgoing, and at least for this reason, applicants submit that amended claim 15 patentably defines over the prior art of record. In view of the forgoing, and at least for the same reason, applicants submit that claim 29 also patentable defines over the art of record.

Since dependent claims 2-14, 16-27 and 32 depend from either claims 1, 15 or 31, and thus inherent all of the limitations of either claims 1, 15 or 31, claims 2-14, 16-27 and 32 also patentably define over the art of recited at least for the same reason as their corresponding base claim

In view of the foregoing, Applicant respectfully submits that the other rejections to the claims are now moot and do not, therefore, need to be addressed individually at this time. It will be appreciated, however, that this should not be construed as Applicant acquiescing to any of the purported teachings or assertions made in the last action regarding the cited art or the pending application, including any official notice. Instead, Applicant reserves the right to challenge any of the purported teachings or assertions made in the last action at any appropriate time in the future, should the need arise. Furthermore, to the extent that the Examiner has relied on any Official Notice, explicitly or implicitly, Applicant specifically requests that the Examiner provide references supporting the teachings officially noticed, as well as the required motivation or suggestion to combine the relied upon notice with the other art of record.

In the event that the Examiner finds remaining impediment to a prompt allowance of this application that may be clarified through a telephone interview, the Examiner is requested to contact the undersigned attorney at 801-533-9800.

Dated this 3rd day of March, 2008.

Respectfully submitted,

/GREGORY R. LUNT/

RICK D. NYDEGGER
Registration No. 28,651
GREGORY R. LUNT
Registration No. 57,354
Attorneys for Applicant
Customer No. 47973

RDN:GRL:ger
GRL0000000130V001